

Appl. No.: 10/674,190
Amendment

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-20 are pending in the present application. Of these claims, claims 1, 2-4, 7-16, 19, and 20 were rejected and claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 were objected to in the present Office Action. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 17-20 have been amended and claims 2 and 6 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections based on the following remarks.

First, Applicants note that the amended claims 1, 9, 11, 12, 14, and 19 presently include a feature of "taking time interval measurements." Support for this claimed feature may be found, for example, in paragraphs 0019, 0039, and 0040 of the present specification. It is noted that the specification makes clear in paragraph 0019, in particular, that taking a time interval measurement includes, but is not limited to, measuring pulse width, period, and phase. Furthermore, paragraph 0040 enumerates various examples of other types of time interval measurements contemplated by the present application.

Claims 1-4, 7-16, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Philipp et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,740,352). The Applicants traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Philipp discloses all of the claimed elements. The Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Philipp does not disclose, among other things, the claimed element of "taking time interval measurements of the at least one data acquisition signal." In particular, Philipp discloses apparatus and methods for testing outputs to an LCD display screen from a computer. To accomplish this testing, Philipp teaches generating digital drive data representative of an electronic signal that drives a display screen. This generated drive data is then converted into pixel data where each of the pixel data

Appl. No.: 10/674,190
Amendment

comprise a value representing an attribute for at least one pixel of the display. A frame storage coupled to the signal converter then stores the pixel data for testing and analysis. Stated another way, Philipp teaches a stimulus processor where pixel data is simply generated from stimulus digital drive data and then analyzed.

Furthermore, Philipp discloses examples of testing including analysis of bitmap results from a capture of a frame set in comparing the bitmap structure to a predetermined set of expected results in order to determine whether or not a test is passed (see col. 10, lines 38–64). Philipp, however, does not teach or suggest in any of the examples that the stored pixel data is tested by “taking time interval measurements” of the stored pixel data. Moreover, time interval measurements would not be applicable to Philipp, which merely is looking at pixels in a captured screen and is not concerned with temporal relationships such as time intervals. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Philipp does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 1 and the rejection should be withdrawn, accordingly.

With respect to claims 3, 4 and 7–8, these claims are also believed to be allowable on their merits and also due to their dependency on independent claim 1.

Amended independent claim 9 also contains similar elements to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, and, thus, this claim is also believed to be allowable over Philipp. Moreover, dependent claims 10–13, which depend from claim 9, are believed to be allowable on their merits and also due to their dependency.

With respect to independent claim 14, this claim additionally contains elements similar to independent claim 1 and is believed to be allowable at least for the reasons discussed above. Claims 15 and 16 are also believed to be allowable on their merits and also because of their dependency on independent claim 14.

Appl. No.: 10/674,190
Amendment

With respect to independent claim 19, this claim includes elements similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and, thus, is believed to be allowable. Additionally, claim 20, which depends from claim 19, is believed to be allowable on its merits and also due to its dependency.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. With this amendment, claim 5 has been rewritten as a single independent claim and also incorporates the subject matter of canceled claim 6 and claims 17 and 18 have been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be allowable.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Patrick B. Law
Registration No. 41,549

Date: March 14, 2005

VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN &
KAMMHOLZ, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005